

# Exhibit 7



1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
3 MARSHALL DIVISION

4 NETLIST, INC., ( CAUSE NO. 2:21-CV-463-JRG  
5 Plaintiff, )  
6 vs. ( )  
7 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., ( )  
et al., ) MARSHALL, TEXAS  
Defendants. ) ( APRIL 17, 2023  
 ) 8:30 A.M.  
8

---

9  
10 VOLUME 2  
11  
12

---

13 TRIAL ON THE MERITS  
14  
15 BEFORE THE HONORABLE RODNEY GILSTRAP  
16 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE  
and a jury  
17

---

18  
19  
20  
21 SHAWN McROBERTS, RMR, CRR  
22 100 E. HOUSTON STREET  
23 MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670  
24 (903) 923-8546  
25 shawn\_mcroberts@txed.uscourts.gov

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: IRELL & MANELLA, LLP -  
3 LOS ANGELES  
4 1800 AVENUE OF THE STARS  
5 SUITE 900  
6 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067-4276  
7 (310) 203-7096  
8 BY: MR. JASON SHEASBY  
9 MS. LISA GLASSER  
10 MR. BEN MANZIN-MONNIN

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

McKOOL SMITH, P.C. - MARSHALL  
104 E. HOUSTON ST., SUITE 300  
MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670  
(903) 923-9000  
BY: MR. SAM BAXTER  
MS. JENNIFER TRUELOVE  
MR. KEVIN BURGESS

FOR THE DEFENDANTS: FISH & RICHARDSON, PC -  
WASHINGTON DC  
1000 MAINE AVE. SW, SUITE 1000  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024  
(202) 783-5070  
BY: MR. RUFFIN CORDELL  
MR. MICHAEL McKEON

GILLAM & SMITH, LLP  
303 SOUTH WASHINGTON AVENUE  
MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670  
(903) 934-8450  
BY: MS. MELISSA SMITH

OFFICIAL REPORTER: SHAWN M. McROBERTS, RMR, CRR  
100 E. HOUSTON STREET  
MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670  
(903) 923-8546

## INDEX

### **EXAMINATION**

<b>Witness Name</b>	<b>Page</b>
SCOTT MILTON	
Cross By MR. McKEON .....	258
Redirect By MR. SHEASBY .....	305
Recross By MR. McKEON .....	317
WILLIAM MANGIONE-SMITH	
Direct By MR. MANZIN-MONIN .....	320
Cross By MR. McKEON .....	385
Redirect By MR. MANZIN-MONNIN .....	445
Recross By MR. McKEON .....	450
MICHAEL BROGIOLI	
Direct By MR. BURGESS .....	454
Cross By MR. CORDELL .....	521

1 THE COURT: Be seated, please.

2 Are the parties prepared to read into the record those  
3 items from the list of pre-admitted exhibits used by last  
4 Friday's portion of the trial?

5 MS. TRUELOVE: Yes, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Please proceed.

7 MS. TRUELOVE: The following JTX exhibits were used  
8 Friday during trial. That would be: 002, 003, 004, 005, 006,  
9 0021, 0024, 0029, 0043.

10 The following PX numbers were also used: 0446, 0464,  
11 0586, 0621, 1663, 1756, 1778, and 1816.

12 And my understanding is Defendants don't have anything to  
13 tender to the Court.

14 THE COURT: All right. Do Defendants have any  
15 objection to the rendition offered by Plaintiff?

16 MS. DEGNAN: No, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: And can you confirm Defendants don't  
18 have additional items from the list of pre-admitted exhibits  
19 to put into the record?

20 MS. DEGNAN: That's correct.

21 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Milton, if you'll return  
22 to the witness stand, please, sir. I remind you, you remain  
23 under oath.

24 Is there anything, Counsel, I need to hear from you on  
25 before I bring in the jury?

1 the '918 and '054 Patents in the DDR5 products we looked at  
2 first?

3 A. That would be 33 percent speed reduction.

4 Q. And to confirm, the way they could have done that is  
5 to move the power management off the module. Is that right?

6 A. That's right. They could have used the earlier  
7 technology where it was not on-module.

8 Q. Okay. So now let's look at the benefits of the '339.

9 Has Samsung identified any alternative technology that  
10 it could have used in place of the '339 inventions to achieve  
11 DDR4 speeds in the LRDIMM accused products?

12 A. No, they have not.

13 Q. If Samsung was aware of an alternative, would you have  
14 expected them to say so?

15 A. Yes. Typically that's what's happened, in my experience.

16 Q. And can you summarize the benefits of the '339 invention  
17 that you've explained?

18 A. Sure. So here I've shown memory controller with four  
19 channels. This is representative of, again, modern servers,  
20 and each channel is populated with two DIMMs in this case.  
21 Without the invention, they could only support one DIMM.  
22 And so, as a result, the capacity with the '339 invention is  
23 doubled.

24 Q. Would DDR4 LRDIMM customers purchase modules that are not  
25 capable of running at DDR4 speeds with two or more modules per

1 channel?

2 A. No, I don't -- I can't imagine that.

3 Q. So let's turn to the last part of your analysis. Can you  
4 describe the comparability analysis you performed?

5 A. Yes. I was asked to consider a licensing agreement that  
6 involved a company called Rambus, consider the technology that  
7 was related to that, and comment on whether I thought it was  
8 comparable to the technology in these patents.

9 Q. And did you find that the agreement was comparable?

10 A. Yes, I did. What I found is that the Samsung technology  
11 related to DDR memory systems and communicating to DDR memory  
12 systems and improving the speed with which the communication  
13 could happen and reducing the power that was required.

14 Q. And what did you conclude about the licensed Rambus  
15 patents?

16 A. That the license was comparable. The technology in the  
17 licensing agreement was comparable to the technology in this  
18 case.

19 Q. Did the patents relate to similar issues to the asserted  
20 patents?

21 A. Yes, very much.

22 MR. MANZIN-MONNIN: Nothing further. I pass the  
23 witness.

24 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we're  
25 just a few minutes before noon, and I've been informed by the

1 case or communicate about it in any way with anyone, including  
2 the eight of yourselves.

3 And with that, ladies and gentlemen, you're excused for  
4 the evening. I'll see you tomorrow morning.

5 (Whereupon, the jury left the courtroom.)

6 THE COURT: Be seated, please.

7 Counsel, for your information, we've used almost 6 hours  
8 and 45 minutes of trial time today. The Plaintiff has 7 hours  
9 and 58 minutes remaining; the Defendant has 7 hours and 56  
10 minutes remaining.

11 Let me encourage you to the fullest extent of my ability  
12 to meet and confer efficiently with regard to disputes that  
13 may develop overnight. I will be in chambers, as I have been  
14 throughout the trial, ready to meet with you in advance of  
15 bringing in the jury and trying to streamline and narrow any  
16 disputes that survive your stringent meet and confer efforts.

17 Is there anything that needs to be raised with the Court  
18 from either Plaintiff or Defendants before we recess for the  
19 evening?

20 MR. SHEASBY: Nothing for Plaintiff.

21 MR. CORDELL: Nothing for Defendants, Your Honor.

22 Thank you.

23 THE COURT: All right. We stand in recess until  
24 tomorrow morning.

25 (The proceedings were concluded at 6:00 p.m.